

---

This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-  
NoDerivs 3.0 Licence.

To view a copy of the licence please see:  
<http://creativecommons.Org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

Draft: Not for Publication or Quotation

(832)

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES  
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, NAIROBI.

Discussion paper No. 58

PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF A SURVEY OF 1964 K.P.E.  
CANDIDATES IN EMBU, KITUI, KERICHO AND NYANZA.

L. Brownstein.

November 1967



This paper is intended for private circulation and should not be quoted or referred to in publication without permission of the author.

Any views expressed in this paper are those of the author. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Institute for Development Studies or of the University College, Nairobi.

DRAFT: NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
OR QUOTATION.

Preliminary Results of A Survey of 1964 KPE Candidates  
in Embu, Kitui, Kericho and Nyanza.

Lewis Brownstein

It has long been thought that the primary school leavers of Kenya might present a serious problem to the economy and possibly even to the political stability of Kenya. Not much is known however, about the magnitude of the problem and little has been suggested to deal with it.<sup>1</sup>

The origins of the problem seem clear enough. Under the impetus of the African nationalist movement and the pressures it generated, the upper primary system in Kenya was expanded at a rapid rate just prior to and after independence, mainly by the abolition of the exam at the end of Standard IV and the consolidation of the previous eight standards to the present seven. Over a period of few years, 1959 to 1964, the number of candidates sitting for KPE mushroomed from 13,655 to about 100,000 a year.<sup>2</sup> As these large numbers of KPE candidates emerged from the <sup>school</sup> system they confronted a job situation which had changed radically over the same period of time. In 1959 there was still a fair chance for a person with only KPE to find employment in Nairobi or in other large towns in the country particularly as the change-over from the colonial regime brought about increased Africanization. But in the succeeding years, supply greatly outstripped demand and by 1964 jobs which once could be obtained with only KPE now required at least some secondary education if not Form IV.

---

<sup>1</sup>The two major exceptions to this statement are: Christian Council of Kenya and Christian Churches Educational Association, After School What?, Nairobi, 1966, and, J. Anderson, "The Adolescent in the Rural Community" in, J.R. Sheffield, ed., Education, Employment and Rural Development, Nairobi, 1967.

<sup>2</sup>This last figure is only an approximation since the Ministry of Education has only published figures on the number of registrants for 1964 (103,400). The actual number who sat for the exam was less.

The expectations of the school leavers themselves, however, were slower to change. Gradually they began to realise that secondary education was the sine qua non of obtaining employment. Thus, when the new Government came to power it found itself under great pressure to expand the secondary system to allow many of these leavers to continue their education.

Experience of other countries in Africa and Asia (particularly Nigeria, Congo (B), India and Burma) has shown, however, that to expand the secondary system too rapidly would only postpone the problem and make it more intractable. The country would then be faced with large numbers of poorly educated secondary school graduates who would be even harder to coax back to the rural areas.

The Government of Kenya in its Development Plan adopted the policy of attempting to provide a sufficient number of qualified secondary school graduates to fulfill the requirements of the Plan. While this necessitated a 53% increase in the number of aided Form I places,<sup>3</sup> the projected output was geared to the anticipated demand. The goal was a rational educational output. This necessarily meant that only about 10% of KPE candidates would be able to go to aided secondary schools. The rest would have to be content with only primary education, with perhaps a very small percentage going on to teacher training colleges and technical schools. The implications of this were that the educational pyramid above KPE would remain narrow and would be expanded as need arose.

It is one of the major findings of this study, however, that this policy of rationality has, in effect, been rejected and in large part circumvented by KPE candidates and their parents. This has been done mainly in three ways: 1. The students have returned to Standard VII or in some cases even to Standard VI and repeated KPE in an attempt to get a high enough pass on the exam to be able to go to Government secondary school; 2. The parents have sent their children to private secondary schools, in many instances even when the child has not passed KPE; 3. Most momentous of all, the parents have banded together and built their own secondary schools, Harambee secondary schools thus presenting the Government with a fait accompli.

---

<sup>3</sup>Republic of Kenya, Development Plan 1966-1970, Nairobi, 1965(?), pp.307-308

The magnitude and implications of these developments will be discussed in the course of this paper. Suffice to say here that it seems to me that Kenya is, willy-nilly, repeating the pattern followed in many other developing countries. The problem of the primary school leaver is rapidly becoming the problem of the secondary school leaver. In a few years time Kenya will be faced with a large number of secondary school leavers coming from schools of relatively low standard who will be quite unwilling to return to the rural areas from which they came. This will be added to the already sizeable primary school leaver problem. It was to determine the magnitude of this latter problem that the present study was undertaken.

#### Aims of the Study

The major aim of this study is to examine systematically what has happened to KPE candidates since they took the exam in 1964. To this end a number of schools in four districts were selected and the students in the classes which sat for KPE in 1964 were followed. The methodology is discussed in the next section.

The main concern was with those students for whom KPE was the terminal exam. We wanted to know how many of these students were getting jobs, how many were leaving home. For those at home, to what extent they occupied on the land? For those who were getting employment, what kinds of jobs were they getting and how were they getting them? For those who were leaving home, why were they leaving and where were they going? Were they returning or did they tend to stay away?

In addition, we wanted to know what these students have been doing since they took KPE. What attempts have they made to obtain further training? What kinds of training and/or jobs were they interested in? If they were at home, what were they doing? To what extent were they able to occupy themselves on their parents land? Were they finding casual labour?

Data was also collected on the families of all the students. We wanted to know if there was any correlation between things such as family wealth, land owned, family size, parents' education, etc., and what subsequently happened to the leaver. In short, the study was viewed as an exploratory survey designed as much to suggest new avenues of research as to provide information on the group being studied.

Methodology:

The study was carried out in Embu, Kitui, Kericho, and Central Nyanza. In each of the first three the schools were selected from relatively homogeneous areas within the districts. Thus, in Embu, all the schools are in the upper area, the coffee and tea growing zones. In Kitui the schools are all from the central region of the district where the growing of cash crops is concentrated. In Kericho all the schools are in Buret division, that is, south of Kericho town in the tea growing area of the district. Finally, in Central Nyanza, four schools are in the Kano plains outside Kisumu and two are on the Nandi Escarpment in the new Siaya District. These last two schools are important since they give some indication as to what might be happening in Kakamega District to the north. The breakdown of the schools studied in each district will be found in Table 1.

It will be readily apparent that these four districts do not constitute a country-wide sample. Since such a sample was felt to be beyond the resources available, the districts were chosen on the basis of characteristics which I felt might affect what ultimately happened to KFE leavers. Thus, Embu is an area of high population density but with high land potential and profitable small cash crop farming; Kitui is a marginal semi-pastoral area, Central Nyaza is a high population, low land potential area, but where settlement schemes and the recent introduction of cash crops are having an impact; Kericho is the most favoured of all with relatively low population density and high land potential. Taking these regional characteristics into account, one hypothesis was that in areas of low land potential &/or high population density, proportionately more school leavers would be leaving home to find work than in areas of high land potential. It was also expected that leavers from these same areas, prodded by the exigencies of their situation, would be finding more employment. Thus, we expected significantly more mobility in Kitui and Nyanza than in Embu and Kericho. Implicit in this reasoning was the assumption that rural young people leave home more out of necessity than choice. The actual findings will be discussed below.

Table 1: Districts and Schools Studied: Number of Students Followed

District & Schools Studied	Number of Students who sat for KPE		Number of Students Followed		Number not followed		
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Married Girls	Too Far or Family moved from district	Not followed for other reasons
<u>EMBU</u>							
Ena	32	16	32	12	4	-	-
Kavutiri**	35	12	35	12	-	-	-
Kianjuki	42	6	38	4	2	3	1
Mbukore*	63	22	59	22	2	2	-
Kiriari	23	22	23	20	2	-	-
Totals	195	78	187	70	10	5	1
<u>KITUI</u>							
Mulango	38	-	37	-	-	1	-
Migwani	35	3	32	-	2	4	-
Mutonguni	60	14	46	5	5	18	-
Totals	133	17	115	5	7	23	-
<u>KERICHO</u>							
Tulwet	51	10	46	5	5	-	5
Kiptewit	34	13	31	11	2	3	-
Boito	47	7	40	6	1	6	1
Chebwan	44	7	42	5	2	1	1
Kaplong	51	-	50	-	-	-	1
Totals	227	37	209	27	9	10	8
<u>C.NYANZA</u>							
Masogo	37	4	36	2	2	1	-
Withur	33	4	31	2	2	2	-
Obwolo	40	6	40	3	3	-	-
Rabour	33	7	31	2	5	2	-
Sigomre	42	-	34	-	-	6	2
Got Osimbo	40	2	40	-	2	-	-
Totals	225	23	212	9	14	11	2
Grand Totals	780	155	723	111	41	49	12
	935		834			101	

\*Two streams

\*\*There were two streams in Kavutiri, but only one was followed. Information on the second was gathered as to where pupils are, but they were not followed.

The study was carried out in the schools listed in Table 1. These schools were not chosen randomly. The major considerations in choosing a school were: a) accessibility: housing for the enumerator, availability of the class list for Standard VII/VIII for 1964, etc.; b) Proportion of boys to girls: the study was more concerned with the former and so we tried to avoid schools with too many girls. Where possible, in fact, we chose schools of all boys (Mulango, Kaplong, Sigomore); c) School's pass rate on KPE relative to the district as a whole: the assumption was that to pick too high or too low would skew the results either in favour of those getting into aided secondary school or those failing to get in. We were not entirely successful in Nyanza where the average pass rate for the schools selected was 61.7% as opposed to a district pass rate of 48%. The figures for the entire sample are in Table 2.

Table 2 Sample School Totals Compared With District Totals

<u>District</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>		<u>Number of Students</u>			<u>Pass Rates</u>	
	<u>Sample</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>District</u>		<u>Sample</u>	<u>District</u>
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)*		
Embu	5	50	273	2566	(10.6%)	31.7%	26.7%
Kitui	3	22	150	819	(18.3%)	42.5%	46.0%
Kericho	5	111	264	4624	(5.7%)	41.3%	33.4%
C.Nyanza	6	110	248	4083	(6.1%)	61.7%	48.0%

\*(3) as a % of (4)

Data was gathered using two forms. (See appendix) One form was for the family and one for the school leaver. A form was filled in for all the students who sat for KPE in the schools studied with the exception of married girls and those who came from too far. These exceptions will be discussed below. In addition, a second form was filled for all male school leavers who were at home either employed or unemployed. Thus, where the boy was still in school, whether in secondary school or repeating in primary school, only the family form was filled. In almost all cases this form was filled by visiting the home of the boy or girl and interviewing some adult there, preferably the mother or father but in some cases where this was not possible, the uncle, oldest sibling, etc.

The second form was administered to the school leaver himself. In a few cases it was not possible to locate the boys even though they were living at home. Appointments made were often broken and in a few instances we had to accept an interview only with the family.



As will be seen from Table 1, out of 935 candidates at the schools studied, 101 were not followed. Forty were married girls, whom it was felt, did not merit special study. Forty-nine came too far to be followed. As a general rule, we did not follow someone if he came from more than ten miles, since every time a student was followed the distance from the school to the home actually had to be doubled. It is interesting to note that these forty-nine respondents represent approximately 5% of the total of those who sat for KPE in the schools studied. In almost all cases, these students were boys who came to the school from their home areas and stayed either at the school, or with relatives, or in housing shared with others like themselves who came from great distances. They came to these schools apparently in order to repeat KPE being unable to obtain a place to do so in their home areas. Thus, in Nyanza, 11, all boys, came from anywhere from 25 to 35 miles away to attend the schools studied. It might be noted that to have attempted to follow these boys, even if the distances could have been negotiated, would have probably been impossible since the boys almost certainly changed their names when they came to the school. This practice of name changing was quite common with repeaters as a way of concealing the fact that they had taken the exam before. It often made the job of tracing the students difficult since the name once used was afterwards usually discarded. In some cases, the school leavers themselves had trouble remembering the names they had used.

The name problem was compounded by the fact that the people we were following had taken the exam almost three years before. Memories in this time grow dim. We found however, that there were two very good sources of information: the headmasters of the schools if they had been there in 1964 and former members of the classes themselves, who, after being interviewed, were often employed to help us find the others in the classes. In a few cases headmasters were used as enumerators since it was felt that they would have less trouble tracing the students. Enumerations were also carried out by university students or in two cases, by Form II leavers.

It is difficult to judge just how representative the sample from each district is. If one goes simply on the basis of pass percentages, questions can certainly be raised about the Nyanza sample. While two schools from Siaya have 48% and 44% pass rates, the sample from Kano plains averages a pass

69.5%, much higher than the district as a whole. Kano plains as a whole had an average pass rate of 56.0%. Thus the four schools of Kano plains probably reflect more clearly what is going on in that area of Central Nyanza rather than the whole district. (Time did not permit in this report for these two areas of the district to be presented separately. This will be done later.)

It should be noted, however, that there are probably many other factors besides pass rate which determine what happens to primary school leavers after KPE. Some of these factors might be: wealth of the families and of the area, opportunities in the area to repeat, history of education in the area, its proximity to urban centers, difference in individual potential etc.

The selection of the schools in relatively homogeneous areas in each of the district also probably affected the representativeness of the samples adversely. Thus, the conditions in lower Embu more nearly approximate parts of Kitui than those of upper Embu from which the schools were drawn.

#### An Overview

The KPE candidates studied fall into eight analytical categories: See Table 3. 1. those in school; 2. those with full-time wage employment, this group further subdivides into those who have employment in their home areas and those employed away from home; 3. those home, not employed, living on their parents' shamba; 4. those self-employed, that is economically self-sufficient, this group included traders, a shopowner, boys who owned and managed their own farms, fishermen and craftsmen. 5. those not home, not employed, presumably looking for work, some of these were in large towns, other, in small towns or rural areas (Large towns were defined as: Nairobi, Mombasa, Thika, Kampala, Nakuru); 6. married girls; 7. unknown, these were boys who had left home and with whom the families had lost contact; 8. miscellaneous, all these were boys in the National Youth Service except one in Embu who was reported to be in Nairobi "studying through correspondence".

Each of the first five groups will be discussed separately below. It should be noted at the outset that there seems to be

greater mobility in Kitui and Nyanza than in Embu and Kericho. Thus, there is a lower percentage in the first two districts who are home not employed. There is also higher percentage in these two areas who are either employed or away from home looking for work. My hypothesis as to why this is true is that conditions in Nyanza and Kitui are forcing the boys from these areas to leave and find opportunities elsewhere. Conversely, conditions are relatively better in Embu and Kericho for someone who wants to stay at home and thus the boys in these areas don't feel the same compulsion to leave. If this hypothesis is correct, it could have important implications for the Government's policy of attempting to get school leavers to return to the land. It is probably futile to ask a boy to return home to his land if either he has no land or he feels he cannot make a living from it.

A word of caution is needed before we proceed. I found in the course of the study that KPE leavers have a habit of moving about a great deal. It is quite possible to find a ten percent change over a period of few months. This change is most common in the employed category and the home not employed category. A boy loses a job or he suddenly leaves home to find one.

#### Those in School

The school breakdown for 1967 will be found in Table Four. There are seven types of schools listed and a miscellaneous category. The major categories are those in Government aided secondary schools, Harambee secondary schools, Private secondary schools, and those repeating standard VII. In addition there are those in Standard VI, those in Teacher training colleges, and finally, those in technical schools. The miscellaneous category includes a boy who was taking a bookkeeping course in the Church Army Centre in Nairobi, another who was taking a tailoring course in the Rural Crafts Centre in Sonet, Kericho, two who were in Seminary schools, one who was in the Agricultural Training Centre in Embu and one girl who in a school in Nairobi the nature of which was unclear.

The overall percentage of those who are still in school is 51.4. The figures are 52.1%, 49.6%, 54.3% and 48.9% for Embu, Kitui, Kericho, and Nyanza respectively. This further breaks down to 25.5% in Government Secondary Schools, 8.1% in Harambee Secondary Schools, and 6.7% in Private Secondary Schools,

Table 3: Overall Breakdown, Four Districts, 1967.\*\*

District	(1) In School	(2) Employed	(3) Home not Employed	(4) Self- Employed	(5) Not Home Not Employed	(6) Married Yields	(7) Unknown	(8) Miscellaneous	(9) Totals
EMBU	139 52.1%	47 17.6%	56 21.0%	3 1.1%	7 2.6%	10 3.7%	0 -	5 1.9%	267 100.0%
KIYU	63 49.6%	30 23.6%	15 11.8%	0 -	11 8.7%	7 5.5%	0 -	1 0.8%	127 100.0%
KERICHO	133 54.3%	28 11.4%	67 27.3%	2 0.8%	3 1.2%	10 4.1%	2 0.8%	1 0.4%	245 99.9%
C. NYANZA	115 48.9%	51 21.7%	32 13.6%	4 1.7%	17 7.2%	14 6.0%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	235 99.9%
TOTALS	450 51.4%	156 17.8%	170 19.4%	9 1.0%	38 4.3%	41 <sup>+</sup> 4.7%	3 0.3%	8 0.9%	875 99.8%

<sup>+</sup>Married girls - 41 = 27.0% of all the girls

\*\*Space did not permit giving breakdown for males and females.

or a total of 40.3% in secondary schools of some kind. In addition, 7.5% are still repeating. This leaves a residual of 3.5% in all the other categories.

The significant figures are those for the students in secondary schools, particularly the Government secondary school figure. According to Ministry of Education estimates, the index of opportunity for entrance in 1964 to aided secondary schools should have been in the neighborhood of 11.2. The index of my sample is more than twice as high. Likewise, the Ministry's overall index of opportunity for entrance to aided and unaided schools was 18.4. Once again my index of 40.3 is more than twice as high.

The explanation for these disparities is to be found, I believe, by looking at the repeating figures for 1965 and 1966 in the schools studied. Thus, in 1965, roughly 36.8% repeated while in 1966, the figure was 16.2%.<sup>3</sup> Many of these repeaters subsequently entered secondary schools after repeating the exam. Thus, from 1965 to 1967 the percentage in Government secondary rose from 14.9% in 1965 to 22.5% in 1966 to 25.5% in 1967.

There are large differences between the districts particularly in the first year, 1965. The Nyanza sample with a much higher overall pass rate on the 1964 KPE, had a higher percentage who entered Government secondary school immediately. In the intervening years, however, the other districts tended to catch up until today, although the Nyanza sample is still ahead, the difference is no where near as great. In fact, 9.4% are still repeating in Embu and 14.7% are still repeating in Kericho. Thus, by next year the gap may be narrowed even further.

---

<sup>3</sup> These percentages do not include the information for married girls. It has not been possible, since these girls were not all followed, to determine where they were in the intervening years. Since they represent only 5% of the total population, their exclusion should not change the resulting total too much.

Table 4: School Distribution, 1967.

District	Government Secondary School	Harambee Secondary School	Repeating Standard VII	In Stan- dard VI	Private Secondary School	Teacher Training College	Tech- nical School	All Other Schools	Totals*
EMBU	66 24.7%	24 9.0%	25 9.4%	0	13 4.9%	5 1.9%	3 1.1%	3 1.1%	267 52.1%
KIPTI	25 19.7%	17 13.3%	4 3.1%	0	9 7.1%	7 5.5%	0	1 0.8%	127 49.5%
KERICHO	61 24.9%	21 8.6%	36 14.7%	1 0.4%	9 3.7%	1 0.4%	2 0.8%	2 0.8%	245 54.3%
NYANZA	71 30.2%	9 3.8%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	28 11.9%	3 1.3%	2 0.9%	0	235 48.9%
TOTALS	223 25.5%	71 8.1%	66 7.5%	2 0.2%	59 6.7%	16 1.8%	7 0.8%	6 0.7%	875 51.3%

\*Percentages are of the total sample, not of those in school.  
Totals at the end give total in sample for the district and  
percentage of sample in school.

Turning to the total in all secondary schools again, Embu had 38.6%. Kitui had 40.1%, Kericho had 37.2% and Nyanza 45.9%. Once again, Nyanza is ahead, followed by Kitui, Embu and Kericho in that order. The figures are roughly comparable but it should be noted that the kinds of schools they are in are not. Thus, for those in Harambee and Private Secondary Schools, Kericho has 12.3%, Embu has 13.9%, Nyanza has 15.7% and Kitui has the highest percentage of all with 20.4%. In both Kitui and Nyanza the percentage in private secondary schools is higher reflecting, I think, a greater willingness on the part of these students to travel to other areas in order to go to secondary schools. It appears that the percentage going to Harambee schools was a function of the places available in each area. Nyanza has apparently been slower to build them and so the places available during this period were less. Whatever the percentages of each of type of school attended, what seems clear is that where the students were unable to go to Government secondary schools they turned to one of the other two types.

The explanation for the rise in secondary school attendance over the years studied is to be found in the large rate of repeating. It will not be possible to discuss this phenomenon here with the detail it deserves, but a few things can be noted. The main reason for repeating seems clear enough. It is an attempt to obtain a high enough pass to go to an aided secondary school. It may be that some children repeat simply in order to gain a certificate, but since this certificate is becoming increasingly meaningless in the competition for employment, this must be a diminishing motivation.

This reasoning is born out by the fact that large numbers of repeaters seem to be repeating after passing the exam. Out of 398 boys who repeated, 206 of them or 51.8% repeated after passing KPE. Since they already had certificates, the only motivation could have been to obtain a high enough pass to be able to go to secondary school. This is confirmed by noting what eventually happened to these 206. Ninety-five or 46.1% got into aided secondary schools, 28, or 13.6% got into harambee schools, 10 or 4.9% are in private secondary schools, and 22 are still repeating. <sup>Thus,</sup> sixty-five percent are in secondary schools of some kind.

The relationship between repeating and secondary school entrance can also be seen by comparing the repeating rates of those in secondary schools and the rest of the sample. (See Table 7) Of those in Government secondary schools, 65.9% were repeaters. The figure for Harambee schools was 83.1% and for private secondary schools, 39.0%. The rest of the sample had 49.7% who were repeaters. If one assumes a direct relationship between repeating and getting into Government secondary schools, these figures would appear to be contradictory. If that assumption were true, the highest repeating rate should be for those in Government schools. The relationship does not appear to be that simple, however. Thus a comparison of the percentage in each group who passed KPE on the first attempt, also shown in Table 7, shows that the respective pass rates for each group were: Government secondary school students, 71.7%; Harambee schools students, 40.8%; private secondary school students, 44.1%; and all the others, 28.3%.

This would suggest that the following is probably taking place: Those who get into Government secondary schools tend, as a group, to be the better students; much larger numbers of them have passed on the first attempt. Over half of the people in this group have had to repeat, however since their first marks on the exam were apparently too low to gain them entrance. Those in Harambee schools may not have done as well on the first attempt, and thus had to repeat more often in order to gain entrance to a secondary school. This is indicated by column two of Table 7 which gives the average number of KPE attempts for those in each group. Harambee school students have the highest average. An alternative or concurrent explanation might be that some students preferred to repeat rather than go to a Harambee school right away (assuming they could do so) on the hope that they would then be able to get into a Government school. Failing that they may have taken Harambee school as a second choice. The correct interpretation probably is a combination of these two.

Those in private schools, finally, seem to have repeated much less than the other categories. The reasons why this is true are not clear. In the absence of interviews with the boys only a guess can be made. It is possible that some students felt that since they had not obtained a place in a Government school, they would rather go to a private school



than to return to Standard VII. Also, entrance to private secondary schools is relatively easy. It should be noted that of the 59 in private secondary schools, 19 or 32.2% never passed KPE. Many of those who failed the first time around (16 out of the 19) may have decided to go to private schools having reached the conclusion that they stood no chance of getting into Government schools.<sup>4</sup> This does not necessarily mean that students of poorer quality are the ones going to private schools, however. Those in private schools it should be noted had a better pass rate overall for the first attempt than did those in Harambee schools. They simply chose not to repeat. Questions must however be raised about the quality of the schools they are going to, schools which admit such a large number of students who have never passed the exam at the end of primary school.

Table 7. Relative Rates of Repeating and Relative Pass Rates on First Attempt of KPE for Those in Government Secondary, Harambee Secondary, Private Secondary and all other Respondents.

Groups	(1) Numbers Who Repeated	(2) Average No. of Attempts*	(3) Number who passed on first attempt	(4) Total in Each Group
Government Secondary	147 (65.9%)	1.8	160 (71.7%)	223
Harambee Secondary	59 (83.1%)	2.0	29 (40.8%)	71
Private Secondary	23 (39.0%)	1.5	26 (44.1%)	59
All Others	239 (49.7%)	1.6	136 (28.3%)	481

\*Average number of attempts was obtained by adding up the total number of times all the people in each group took KPE and dividing through by the total in each group. Note that some took the exam three and even four times.

It can be seen from the above discussion that repeating is pervasive phenomenon. It should certainly be receiving more attention than it is at present. Repeaters are taking up places

---

<sup>4</sup>There may be another explanation. We found one boy who having failed KPE, went to Uganda, to a private secondary school for one year, returned to Kenya and entered a good Harambee School, one which is in the process of being taken over by the Government, never having passed KPE.

which could be perhaps filled by other students. More significantly, repeating by one group forces the students who are taking the exam for the first time to do the same. Thus, a student who is sitting for the exam for the first time is competing with someone who has already had a crack at it. Since the repeater tends to do better, the first-timer must repeat himself if he hopes to go on to secondary school. This creates an atmosphere where students become convinced that repeating pays. They see other students getting into government and harambee schools after repeating and thus assume that they will have to do the same. In effect, therefore, for the repeater, Kenya still has an eight standard system. The only difference is that the repeater instead of getting the benefit of an eighth standard with perhaps new material to study, repeats the work he already did the year before, or in many cases for the last two years.

Repeating also impresses me as being quite wasteful of resources. If my hypotheses are correct, and the better students end of by getting into Government schools anyway, why not eliminate repeating altogether and make the exam a once-for-all affair? Looked at another way, if there have been about 30% repeaters in every group of KPE candidates since 1964, this would mean about 122,000 students repeated from 1964 to 1966. Multiplied by 90/= for each student, the cost of school and exam fees, this would mean roughly 10,980,000/= over three years time. Surely this money could be better employed in preparing the students for life in their home areas. This point is simply raised for discussion, since abolishing repeating is not a matter to be taken lightly. It would have great political ramifications and would have to be carried out in conjunction with a much larger program designed to re-orientate the students towards life in the rural areas.

Before ending this section on those students presently in schools, some attention should be given to the ramifications of some of the figures discussed here. It seems clear that in all the districts studied, many more students have been continuing their education than the Government envisioned. If this is the case throughout the rest of Kenya as well, the implications are grave indeed. It means, as suggested at the beginning of this paper, that Kenya will soon be faced with many more students with at least some secondary education than the Plan calls for. While it is true that all of those in Harambee and private schools may not reach Form IV, many undoubtedly will, and the rest will probably go as far as Form II and sit for the Kenya Junior Secondary Examination.

If past experience in other countries is any guide, these students will be ill-prepared for the life they will emerge from the school system to face. They will tend to see themselves as "educated" people. They will tend to reject life in the rural areas. While there is no certainty that they will migrate to the urban areas, they will tend to be very dissatisfied wherever they are. There are indications that jobs even for boys with Form IV are getting scarce in some areas. What will happen to those with only Form II?

It seems to me that the picture is not one of unrelieved gloom, however. The people in the rural areas have shown an ability, when they think the stakes are high enough, to generate tremendous amounts of money to educate their children. The Harambee school movement must be seen as nothing short of phenomenal. Nonetheless, it is my feeling that at the moment this energy is misdirected. These Harambee schools, and they are growing at an ever increasing rate, are going to be turning out boys and girls, who, while more sophisticated than their KPE counterparts, are going to be even less prepared for life in the rural areas precisely because of this sophistication. As reality makes itself felt, the sense of disillusionment on the part of parents and students will be keen. There is, I think, still time to change this picture. Perhaps the Harambee school movement could be redirected with a view towards getting parents and students to accept the fact that secondary education can have the function of preparing one for life in the rural sector as well as the urban. This is a question with ramifications too wide to be discussed here. It is simply raised in order to serve as a focus for further consideration.

We now turn to a consideration of the other major groups of leavers. It had been hoped that data comparing the secondary school students and the other for variables such as family wealth, parents' and siblings' education could be presented at this time. This was not possible. It does appear from a cursory examination however, that there is a positive correlation between family wealth and father's education and the students in secondary school, but this will have to wait for further analysis.

### Those Employed

The overall percentage of those employed for the sample was 17.8%. As can be seen from Table 3, there were differences between the districts. Kitui had the highest with 23.6%, followed by Nyanza with 21.7%. Embu with 17.6% and finally, Kericho with 11.4%. This again seems to substantiate the hypothesis that the students from Kitui and Nyanza have felt more impetus to get off the land than those from Embu and Kericho. The former, coming from areas of relatively low land potential, have possibly been more resourceful and have had to try harder to find work. On the other hand, it is possible that they got more help from members of their families who already had employment.

The evidence is not conclusive on this last point. I gathered data on the questionnaire on how many siblings in the student's immediate family were employed. This did not include the extended family and thus an important factor is left out. Nonetheless, the students from Kitui and Nyanza with jobs score higher when compared with the others from their area than did those with jobs from Embu and Kericho. The comparison is shown in Table 7. Since these percentages have not been tested yet for significance, I can't say whether these differences are meaningful. In addition, I will have to go through the questionnaires to see whether there is any correlation between the types of jobs the siblings have or where they are working and the employment which the respondent has. If the respondents are working in the same places as their siblings there would be a strong presumption that the sibling were instrumental in getting them the jobs.

Table 7. Percentage of Families Who have At least one Sibling Employed.

	Employed Group %	All Others %
Embu	42.6	41.0
Kitui	46.7	37.8
Kericho	28.6	31.9
Nyanza	54.9	38.8

There is also a difference between the districts in terms of when the students got the jobs they presently hold. Of those employed today, much higher proportions in Kitui and Nyanza were employed in 1965 than was the case in Embu and Kericho. By 1966, the proportions had risen in each district, but Kericho was still far behind the rest of the districts and Embu was a full 20 percentage points behind Kitui and Nyanza. The comparisons are shown in Table 8. Once again, I am not sure why these disparities should appear. I hope to compare the kinds of jobs held by the students from each district as well as their ages. It is possible, that the students from Nyanza and Kitui since they were in Standard VIII, while those from Embu and Kericho were in Standard VII, were older and thus left home to find work earlier while the rest stayed at home and either repeated or stayed on the land.

Table 8. Percentage of the Employed Group in Each District Employed in 1965 and 1966

	1965 %	1966 %
Embu	25.5	63.8
Kitui	46.7	83.3
Kericho	17.9	32.1
Nyanza	43.1	54.9

It might also mean that one of the original hypotheses is correct and the students from Nyanza and Kitui are getting more help and therefore were able to leave straight from school to find work.

The jobs the students have been getting are shown in Table 10 for those employed at home and Table 11 for those employed away from home. It is clear that the majority of boys getting jobs are having to leave home. As shown in Table 9, this was true for all the districts studied. For the girls, however, most of those employed were living at home. I have not yet broken the figures down for those employed away from home in and out of their home districts or for those in and not in big cities. I believe that such a breakdown would show that those from Kericho are in their home district, while the boys from Nyanza are all over the country. This may require a re-definition of the categories so as to give a clearer picture of how much employment is being generated in the home areas.

Table 9. Percentage of the Employed Group Living at Home and Away from Home in Each District.

	Home Employed (%)		Not Home Employed (%)	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Embu	20.0	50.0	80.0	50.0
Kitui	46.4	100.0	53.6	----
Kericho	22.7	83.3	77.3	16.7
Nyanza	11.1	----	88.9	100.0
Totals	22.2	61.9	77.8	38.1

(The numbers for the girls are small which affects the percentages. In Nyanza, only one girl was employed.)

The main employer in the home areas seems to be the school system. Eighteen out of the 30 boys employed at home (60.0%) were employed in schools mostly as untrained teachers. The same was true for the girls, (ten out of the thirteen) Only one boy and one girl were trained teachers.

For those employed away from home, the main employer for the boys has been the Kenya Government. Twenty-nine out of 105 (27.6%) were employed by either the Army (8) Police (13), GSU (3), Prisons (4) or in one case as an Agricultural Assistant. Nine boys were untrained teachers. I suspect that most of these latter were probably living in their home districts but I still have to check this out. If so, I will probably re-classify them as being home employed. Eighteen boys were working as clerks. These ranged from clerks for the tea estates in Kericho, where the boys tabulate the tea being picked, to boys who worked for E.A.R. & H. Twelve boys were working as unskilled laborers. Some were turnboys (working on up-country buses), some were working as laborers for construction companies, or in coffee factories etc.

Of the girls employed away from home, four were nurses and two were working as bar-maids.

Table 10: Home Employed, Jobs Held

Type of Job	Males	Females	Type of Job	Males	Females
Untrained Teacher	15	4	Shopkeeper	1	-
Nursery School Teacher	2	5	Office Messenger	1	-
Trained Teacher	1	1	Apprentice (Mechanic)	1	-
Unskilled Laborer	5	1	Home Crafts Teacher	-	1
Clerk	1	1	Salesman	1	-
Agricultural Assistant	1	-	Nature of Job not Ascertainable	1	-
			Totals	30	13

Table 11: Not Home Employed, Jobs Held

Type of Job	Males	Females	Type of Job	Males	Females
Police	13	-	Shopkeeper	4	-
Army	8	-	Office Messenger	3	-
GSU	3	-	Bar-maid	-	2
Prisons	4	-	Apprentice (mechanic, tailor etc.)	6	-
Agricultural Assistant	1	-	Nurse	-	4
Clerk	18	1	Community Development Worker	-	1
Semi-skilled worker	4	-	Tea picker	4	-
Unskilled Laborer	12	-	Court Prosecutor	1	-
Houseboy	5	-	Receiving on the job training	2	-
Hospital Dresser	1	-	Untrained teacher	9	-
Agricultural Laborer	2	-	Nature of job not ascertainable	5	-
			Totals	105	8

While there is a wide range of jobs the students are getting, a rough count indicates that about 35% of the boys employed are in jobs which can be defined as either unskilled or insecure. The unskilled jobs include unskilled laborer, shopkeeper, office messenger, salesman, houseboy, tea picker. I would classify untrained teacher as an insecure job. These teachers are the first to be fired, last to be hired.

Of course, it is not possible, simply by looking at the list to determine which boys have jobs which could be considered permanent and which have jobs they are likely to lose in the near future. A clerk is not necessarily more secure than an office messenger. Nonetheless, as we shall see in the section on those boys home not employed, out of the 30 who had jobs and subsequently lost them, 26 were either unskilled workers or untrained teachers. Only three had been clerks. On the other hand, it is heartening that the proportion employed is almost as great as that home not employed.

There were many correlations which I had hoped to be able to do but for which there simply wasn't time. These included variables such as KPE performance, repeating, family wealth, father's occupation, etc. These will have to be done later.

#### Not Home Not Employed

As with the employed group, there is a similarity in the results for Kitui and Nyanza on the one hand and Embu and Kericho on the other. While the overall percentage for those not home, not employed is only 4.3, the figure for boys in Kitui is 9.6% and for Nyanza, 8.0%, while the proportion in Embu and Kericho is only 2.1 and 1.4% respectively. This would again suggest that conditions in Kitui and Nyanza are causing relatively more boys to leave home to find work than in Embu and Kericho.

All the boys from Kitui are in either Mombasa or Nairobi. (Table 12) Twelve of 17 from Nyanza are in big cities; three of the four in Embu are also in big cities. But in Kericho, none of the boys was in a big city. In fact, the three listed had left home only a few days before to go to the tea estates to find work. They were probably back home within a few days.

In the other districts, especially in Nyanza, some of the boys have been gone for as much two years, going on three when the data was collected. This does not mean that they did not come home during the time since the exam; but if they did, they didn't stay for long.



Table 12: Those Not Home, not employed. Where they are, When they Left.

	In a big city		Not in a big city		Males Away in	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	1965	1966
Embu	3	3	1	-	1	2
Kitui	11	-	-	-	2	6
Kericho	-	-	3	-	-	-
Nyanza	12	-	5	-	8	11

The fact that more boys seem to be leaving home and going to the big city from Nyanza and Kitui throws I think, some light on the whole question of urban migration by school leavers. It is my belief that a number of conditions have to be present for a boy from an upcountry area far from the big city to leave home and make a trip like this. First, he probably has to feel a strong need to do so. A trip to city like Nairobi or Mombasa for someone who has never gone is not an experience to be taken lightly. If life at home is tolerable, if the boy feels he has a chance of making it, he may feel a strong reluctance to leave. Second, he needs somewhere to stay when he gets to the city. In areas like Nyanza and Kitui where many other have left before them, the boys going to the cities probably have relatives they can turn to. This is probably less true for someone from Embu and in Kericho; it is very rare for people to migrate to the big cities. Third, the boy needs some money for the bus fare and for some expenses when he gets there. Finally, and perhaps most important, the boy needs a feeling of confidence that it is worth it for him to make the trip in the first place. I had the feeling in my discussions with boys home on the land in Embu that they knew what the job situation was in Nairobi and they saw little point in investing the time and the money to go there. Many of them said they had no one who could help them and since it was impossible to get a job without help, why go. Many also seemed to feel that Nairobi was an unfriendly place one which repelled them.

This raised the question: if there is this inertia, where are all the boys we see on the streets of the big cities coming from? The answer is, I think, that in large part they are coming from areas close to the cities themselves. Thus, in Nairobi, I would guess they probably are coming from

Murang'a and Kiambu. In the case of boys from these districts, the conditions listed above would still apply but they be met much more easily. The cost of a trip from these areas is less; the problem of where to stay is much less important since they can often make the trip in and back the same day. In short, much less is invested financially and perhaps even psychically by boys from areas near Nairobi than by those from districts far from the city.

If this reasoning is correct, and if the proportions of school leavers home not employed from these areas are of the same order as the areas I have studied, then approximately 25% of the school leavers would be making regular trips to Nairobi in numbers great enough to create strong pressure on the job market in the city. The bulk of the rest would be coming from areas like Nyanza and Kitui (and Machakos) where the exigencies of their situations would be forcing them to migrate as well. I emphasise that these are simply guesses made on the basis of observations and that they remain to be tested. What is needed, I think, is a study on the school leaver in the city.

In any case, I hope to know more about this question once I have had a chance to analyse the information from the group home not employed. Approximately 40% of this group made trips at some time or other to find jobs. About half of this group went to big cities at least once. What I haven't been able to do yet is to break these figures down by district to see what the proportions for each district have been, how many trips the boys tended to make, how long they stayed, and hopefully, why they went in the first place. On this last point, I hope to correlate land size and family size for each of those at home to see whether from the larger families or those with less land are the ones leaving home.

#### Self-Employed

The self-employed group was defined narrowly to include only those boys who are economically self-sufficient. Nine boys were included in the group. This included two traders and two fishermen in Nyanza, one shopowner in Embu, one craftsman in Kericho, and three boys who owned and managed their own farms, two in Embu and one in Kericho.

Questions can perhaps be raised as the definition of owning and managing one's own farm. In Embu there were nine other boys who owned land but who were nonetheless defined as being home not employed. The reason was that the land, while in their names was still held in a common unit and managed by the father or older sibling. The land came under the sons' names at the time of land consolidation but since the boys are not yet married they do not have control over it.

Some of the boys, particularly one of the traders in Nyanza have shown great initiative. One of the boys there trades in sisal, buying from local farmers in the area and selling it to the sugar plantation at Muhoroni. The craftsman in Kericho is a tailor, trained by his brother. The fishermen in Nyanza have managed to get their own equipment and though the work is only seasonal make about 200/- a month when the rains are on.

In time, many of the boys who are home unemployed may be expected to join this group, as their fathers die and they inherit the land and as they marry and are given land.

There will not be room in this section to give more than an impressionistic picture of the school leaver in the rural area. The data for this section came from the second form which is in the appendix. It is hoped to be able to correlate much of the information on this form with that on the first form later on.

One of the most revealing questions, I think, on this second form is the last one, question 34, in which the boys were asked to rank four possible alternatives and to explain their first choices and their last choices. The alternatives were "stay where I am", "get a job with a regular wage", "get a piece of land on a settlement scheme", and "get a place in a Harambee secondary school". These alternatives were thought to be most relevant to boys who had left school. Thus, Harambee school was offered and not Government secondary school.

The answers to this question were quite striking. (See Table 10) One hundred out of 133 gave their first choice as get a job. This was followed by 24 who said Harambee school, 8 who chose settlement scheme first and only one who said his first choice was to stay where he was.

Broken down by last choice, 115 said their last choice was to stay where they were, eleven gave settlement scheme as their last choice, 6 said Harambee school and only one said get a job.

Table 10. Answer to Question 34: Ranking of Four Alternatives

Alternative	First Choice		Last Choice	
	No.	%	No.	%
Stay where I am	1	0.8	115	86.5
Get a job	100	75.2	1	0.8
Settlement Scheme	8	6.0	11	8.3
Harambee School	24	18.0	6	4.5

It would seem then, that the boys at home on the land are, for the most part, thinking more in terms of having to support themselves than continuing with their education. This does not mean that if given the chance they would not accept further training. (98 out of the 133 said they would like to continue with further training in the future). But a job seem to be their main priority.

The reasons for this seem clear. Their comments indicated that what is bothering them is that while they stay at home on

their parents' land they are not their own masters. They have no way of earning their own money. They are not, in their own estimation, men. Also, they felt, many of them, that staying where they are and working on the land earns them very little return for a great deal of energy expended. These feelings are revealed in a selection of some of the comments the boys made when they were asked to explain their last choice, that is, staying where they were:

"Home is no good since one lasts for four months having not got even a cent." (Embu)

"Because this condition of staying home without a job is very bad because I can't clothe myself and it is very bad for a grownup person to depend on parents in manner things like soap, paraffin and so on." (Kitui)

"Because sometimes I may even plant a certain crop and get nothing in return - dried up." (Embu)

"I don't get any money here so I will always be depending on my parents." (Kericho)

"I have been at home two and one-half years so I can't afford to stay home still. Otherwise I get little gain from years of education." (Nyanza)

Granting that they want jobs, how realistic are they about what they can do. The charge is often made that school leavers have an inflated view of themselves; they think they are capable of doing jobs far beyond their abilities. To try and get some idea of their realism, I listed 13 jobs on the questionnaire and asked them whether they thought they had the education and experience to do them. There was the danger that they would say yes to the jobs they liked and no to the ones they did not like. I don't think that by and large this happened, however. The results of the question are given in Table 11.<sup>7</sup> One hundred fifty of 155 (96.8%) asked said they could do jembe farmer. Approximately 75% said they could do turnboy and 64.9% said they could do houseboy. These three jobs, however, ended at the bottom of the list on the job preference questions. Also, four jobs were included which I felt the boys in most cases could not do: radio announcer, typist, driver, and accountant.

---

<sup>7</sup>Not all the jobs appeared on the questionnaires at the same number of times. This was because at the beginning of the study, a few changes were made. Also, there was not time to separate out the interviews with the boys who had jobs. This will probably change some of the percentages but I doubt it change the rank order.

These four received the lowest percentage of yes responses. Nonetheless, some of the boys are being unrealistic. I hope to go through the questionnaires at some point and find out which ones they <sup>are</sup> and why they might have said yes to some of these last four jobs.

Table 11. Answer to Question 33: Which of these jobs can you do?

Job	Yes	No	% who said yes
Jembe farmer	150	5	96.8
Primary School Teacher	135	20	87.1
Office messenger	131	24	84.5
Clerk	117	29	80.1
Shopowner	119	36	76.8
Turnboy	115	40	74.2
Houseboy	100	54	64.9
Policeman	90	65	58.1
Modern farmer	78	68	53.4
Radio Announcer	36	119	23.2
Typist	23	118	16.3
Accountant	20	126	13.7
Driver	21	134	13.6

As for the jobs they said yes to most often, I feel they are probably correct. These are, by and large, the jobs the boys have been getting. If anything, some of them may even be underestimating what they can do. The results for modern farmer are particularly interesting when the districts compared. Out of the thirty-seven boys questioned in Nyanza, 31 said "No" to modern farmer while they all said "Yes" to Jembe farmer. In Embu, the situation with respect to modern farmer was reversed. Forty-one out of 50 boys questioned in that district said "yes" to modern farmer, with only two saying "No" to Jembe farmer. In the other two districts, the split was about even with a little more than half saying "No" in Kericho to modern farmer and a little less than half saying "No" in Kitui to modern farmer.

The explanation for these differences will have to wait until I have had a chance to compare the family forms for each of these boys with the second form to see whether those boys whose families are growing cash crops are the ones who are

saying "yes" to modern farmer and vice-versa. The contrast between Nyanza and Embu is quite marked, however, suggesting that the boys are probably thinking both in terms of their own skills and the potential of their areas. The response for each district to modern farmer was:

	Yes	No	% yes
Embu	41	8	85.4
Kitui	10	6	62.5
Kericho	21	23	47.7
Nyanza	6	31	16.2

It was my impression in talks with some the boys that they were so anxious to get work that they would be willing to take almost anything. This feeling probably becomes stronger the longer they stay at home without work. Thus, questions as to which jobs they would rather have are of less importance than what their minimum desires are. This last question requires more study, I think. For example, how much does a boy feel a job must pay before he is willing to leave home to take it?

Nonetheless, it is interesting to see which jobs the boys prefer when they are given the chance to choose. One of the questions asked: "Which job would you most like to have?" The answers are given in Table 12. These answers show that once again, the boys' sights are not set that high.

Table 12: Response to Question 31: "Which Job would you most like to have?"

Job	Number	Job	Number
Teacher	33	Typist	1
Clerk	25	Bookkeeper or Accountant	1
Mechanic	17	Doctor	1
Farmer	10	GSU	1
Driver	7	Mason	1
Army	6	Shopkeeper	1
Police	6	Trader	1
Any Kind	4	Artist	1
Self-Employed		Vetinary Surgeon	1
Businessman	4	Prison Warder	1
Salesman	4	I don't know	1
Office Messenger	3	Not Ascertainable	1
Tailor	2		
		Total	133

The question was asked before they were presented with a list of jobs so that hopefully it gives an indication of what they are thinking about without having first been prompted. Their choices are, it seems to me, quite reasonable, with a couple of exceptions. (Doctor, veterinary surgeon, bookkeeper or accountant). It is interesting that when seventy of the boys were presented with a list of jobs and asked which they liked very much, which a little bit and which they did not like, the same three jobs (clerk, mechanic, teacher in that order) came out on top. (Question 33, p.4C).

Once again, however, I feel these questions are less meaningful than those designed to find out what the boys' minimum conditions for accepting employment are. For example, when the ninety boys who said they expected to leave home to look for work in the future were asked what job they would try to find, 31.1% simply answered "anykind". (Question 28) And when the whole group was asked if they would refuse any of the jobs listed in question 33, p.3, 75 (56.4%) said no. Of those who said yes (58), 23 mentioned either houseboy, or turnboy, giving as their main reasons, that either they were too hard, too menial or the pay was too low (or some combination of these). It is interesting that while a few boys said they would refuse jembe farmer, none said they would refuse modern farmer.

All this indicates, I think, that the boys could be absorbed into job programs which would not have to promise them the moon. While they will not work for just any wage they do not demand wage levels which are unrealistic. This whole question requires more study. Though I hope to be able to say more about it at a future date when I can analyse the responses more fully, I feel more interviews with boys in the home areas are needed stratified perhaps according to educational background. It would be interesting to see for example, how Harambee school & private secondary school graduates would respond to these questions.

If it is true that what the boys want most is employment, just how hard have they tried to find work? The answer to this question is not yet clear. Of the 133 questioned, only 14 had had their names listed with a labour exchange. Whether this is because they don't feel it is worth it or because they don't know of its existence, I am not sure. Only 54 had left home to



find work going either to big cities or in their home areas. But, 100 of the 133 had made written applications for jobs. This may reflect the fact that many of them feel the best way to get a job is send a written application for it. When they were asked what the best way is to find a job, (question 11) 45.9% mentioned sending a written application.

However, my questionnaire made one major error which may have affected the results of this section substantially. Question nine says: "List here all the jobs you have applied for..." I have since discovered that in their terminology, "to apply" means only to write an application for a job. When you see someone in person, you are not "applying". Thus, my questionnaire has picked up information on how many letters the boys have written, and how many times they left home, but not necessarily on how many people they have asked for work.

The boys questionned did not seem to expect much help in finding employment. When if anyone had given them advice on how to get a job, 92 (69.2%) said "No." Of the rest, nine mentioned a headmaster or teacher, 27 a relative (father, sibling or other relative), five said friends and one said his county education officer. When asked who could help them most to get a job, 38 (28.6%) said no one. Fifty-four mentioned a relative, twenty-four a headmaster or teacher, ten a friend, four a politician or M.P., and one a headman, (two were vague: "a big man", "Government"). But when asked why these people could help, only about 35% could give a specific reason. The rest simply said "he likes me and wants to help" (relative), or, "he knows me and can recommend me" (teacher and headmaster).

In actual fact, most of those who got work of some kind, (and subsequently lost it) heard of the jobs through some kind of personal contact (19 out of the 30). The same was true for those boys who were interviewed who have jobs now (16 out of 26). This suggests that those who are getting work are probably being helped by others in some way. It does not mean that these personal contacts are necessarily using influence to help the boys, although that is possible in some cases, but simply that the boys were being steered towards the jobs by others who were in a position to know of the vacancies.

Of the thirty boys who had found employment and subsequently lost it, 26 had found one job and four had had two jobs. The jobs they had were:

Shopkeeper	11
untrained teacher	10
clerk	3
hotel keeper	2
national youth service	2
houseboy	2
unskilled laborer	1
agricultural assistant	1
agricultural laborer	1
laboratory assistant	1

The wages they were paid ranged from less than 60/= per month to more than 300/= per month. Most, (20 out of the 30) earned less than 130/= p.m. Untrained teachers earned either 129/= p.m. or 160/= p.m. depending on the district.

Most of the boys were let go by the employer, especially the untrained teachers, or lost the job because of some change in the business. In one case the shop the boy was working for went bankrupt. In a few other cases, the shop changed hands and the new owners put on their own people. Five boys quit because the wages paid were too low. For the most part, the jobs did not last long. Seventeen of the thirty lost the job before having it for six months, eleven had the job anywhere from seven months to one year and only two had it for more than one year.

One of the things we wanted to know from this study was the extent to which those boys at home on the land were occupied on their parents' shambas. I have not been able to break this down by area yet, but the number of days the boys reported working on the land the month previous to the study is given below in Table 13. Almost 90% of them reported doing some work and about 60% said they worked 13 days or more. However it is not possible to tell from these figures just how occupied the boys were. We tried to get around this by asking what they do, but the answers were not conclusive.

Table 13. How Many Days Did You Work On the Farm Last Month?

Number of Days Worked	none	1-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25+	N.A. or not appl.
	16	14	13	25	33	21	11
	12.0%	10.5%	9.8%	18.8%	24.8%	15.8%	8.3%

In any case, it would appear most of them are working on their parents' land and not on their own land or on land which is set aside for them. Only 40 (30.0%) said they grow their own cash crops and/or food crops. I believe most of these forty boys come from Embu, but I will have to get the exact breakdown later.

Most of the boys seem to stay pretty close to home most of the time. Thus, when they were asked how often they went to the nearest town (Embu, Kitui, Kericho, Kisumu), about 40% said they went once a month or less. Approximately 10% said they had never gone. Most of this latter group came from Kericho. When asked why they went, 68 (51.1%) gave their main reason as going to look for work. Otherwise they went into town for the usual reasons: to shop in the market, visit friends, "find out the news", see the local sports meets, etc.

Some of the boys, about forty percent, occupy some of their time by getting casual labour. Most of these get work cultivating or watching cattle on other people's shambas (27 out of 49), or as day laborers (14 out of 49). The other jobs mentioned included one boy who was a clerk in a coffee factory for a few days, one boy who worked as a trader, four in Nyanza who worked as fishermen, one who worked trapping animals, and one who earned money helping in political campaigning.

As might be expected, this kind of work is irregular. Thus, of the 49 who said they get casual labour, only 31 had actually gotten any the month before. Of these, 15 worked for five days or less, seven worked for between six and ten days and only five worked 21 days or more. (four were not ascertainable.) Wages paid ranged from one shilling to more than eight shillings a day with about one-half the boys earning three to five shillings per day.

Time has not allowed for an analysis of the boy's expectations for the future. These are covered in questions 23-31. This analysis will be done in the near future. At best, only a guess will be possible anyway. Most of the questions are projective and the answers will have to be treated with caution.

#### Conclusion

One of the questions which has come to my mind many times in the course of this study has been: of what use was the education the boys now at home received? How has it fitted them for the lives they are living today? On the positive side, and I think incidentally that the boys would be the first to recognise this, it has made them marginally literate and thus able to function to some extent in a modern Kenya. They can perhaps do basic arithmetic and can read, with difficulty, the country's news papers. (In my discussions with some of them, however, I found many who were unable to speak English at all much less write it.)

Nonetheless, the education they received did little to prepare them for what they are doing now. It gave them no agricultural skills. It failed to instill in them the feeling that to remain at home and work the land was a worthwhile and meaningful occupation. Its whole orientation seemed to be to prepare them for a school most of them were never supposed to enter. The boys themselves feel that to stay at home is in fact to waste the education they have had. From their point of view, subsistence farmers are not educated men and educated men are not subsistence farmers. For the meantime they are staying put, probably having little alternative. They cannot, however, be characterised as being satisfied with their situation.

If, as I believe to be true, these boys can be multiplied by the hundreds throughout the rest of Kenya, the country is faced with a serious problem indeed. These are boys who are becoming increasingly divorced from the political system of the country, who feel that it has little relevance to them. While I don't believe that they are bitter yet, the potential is there. For the meantime, they remain fairly optimistic. But there are those who have reached the conclusion that the future points down not up. If this feeling were to become widespread, it could cause dislocations greater than those which presently exist.

Objectively, the future does not look particularly bright for these boys. At the moment, they have little more to look forward to than an acre and a hoe. Virtually no programs exist in the country to deal with them. Their families, burdened with many other children to get through school, feel that the boys, who are now educated, should be working to help support the rest. This puts an additional pressure on a boy who already feels frustrated in trying to carry his own weight. This frustration can only grow in the future.

When this group is added <sup>to</sup> those who are and who will be emerging from the Harambee and private secondary schools, the problem assumes major proportions. The Harambee schools in Kenya (the exact number is unknown at this moment) account for about 50% at a minimum of Form I entries at the present time. If the Government counts on the output of the aided schools to fill the manpower needs of the future, what is going to happen to those coming out of these other secondary schools? It is possible that some of them will replace those who are presently working with only KPE (untrained teachers, unskilled workers) but many of them will probably be unwilling to accept these jobs. Even if they do, they will only displace those who presently hold them thereby both compounding the primary school leaver problem and increasing the pressure to build more Harambee schools. The Government's recent announcement that it intends taking over 80 Harambee schools shows that it feels the pressure; but this only allievates the problem, it does not solve it.

In the years since 1964 when the subjects of this study took KPE, the Harambee schools have mushroomed. If the repeating rate has remained constant at about 35%, this would suggest that even more than 40% of the present batch of KPE candidates will end up eventually in some kind of secondary school. This must lead, in few years' time, to a situation where the country is faced with many more students with secondary education than it originally planned for.

Perceptions of problems are very slow to change. I have the impression that most people still think in terms of the secondary shortage of a few years ago and assume that the primary school leaver is the one who merits attention. In my estimation, both groups are going to be a major problem in the

years to come. What is needed, I think, is a re-thinking of the role of secondary and indeed primary education in the country. The boys coming out of Harambee schools are going to be even less prepared for life in the rural areas than their primary school counterparts. Their sense of dissatisfaction is bound to be greater, their willingness to stay at home is bound to be less. Some way must be found to prepare them for what they are going to find and to help them once they find it.